

REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for a user operable element positioned over the display to enable viewing of the display through the element, the operable element having a non-monotonic response to user actuation.

In the additional comments, the Examiner opines that if one pressed the outer portions of the element 24 in Selig he would receive a different actuation than if he pressed the inner portion or central portion of that element 24.

But, even if this is so, and that is not free from doubt whatsoever, actuating near the edge or actuating near the center of an elastic element necessarily results in a linear response. The Examiner points out that the material is elastic. Therefore, the more you press, the more displacement you get. The harder you press, the more displacement you get. If you press in the center or you press on the edge, you always get a response that is not non-monotonic.

The suggestion that the element has a non-monotonic response to user actuation because the user could press at two different locations, misses the point. The user can press in the center or the user can press on the edge. Whichever one the user chooses to press on, he fails to get a non-monotonic response. He gets a pure elastic response from the edges, according to the Examiner, and a buckling response from the center. But neither of these would amount to a non-monotonic response.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested. On the same basis, reconsideration of the rejection of the other claims is also requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

1/12/05



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]